



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FUTURE OF RELIGION

STEWART MEANS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

No one who has studied the history of the last century can fail to be struck by the great changes which have taken place in human thought, affecting the whole outlook of man in his relation to the world both within and without and constituting a revolution in the intellectual life of our times. The most permanent forces in human life have been brought face to face with new facts, new conditions, and new ideas, and nowhere do we find the evidences of this change in outlook greater than in the sphere of religion, where the old problems and the old controversies are passed or passing. One of the great questions of today is, as a recent writer has said, "whether Christianity can come to terms with the awakening self-consciousness of modern civilization, equipped with a vast mass of new scientific knowledge and animated for the first time by ideals which are not borrowed from classical or Hebrew antiquity."¹ But Christianity itself has already been deeply influenced by some of the changes which have taken place. The great forces of history press steadily upon all the institutions of society and the form or expression of the religious life is profoundly affected by the movements of thought or changes in sentiment which take place in human society.

A favorite illustration has long been to liken the Church to the Ark in which are gathered those who are to be carried safely across the stormy sea of Time to the haven where they would be. The figure has other suggestions, however, than the old ecclesiastical one. The church may be a ship floating upon the stream of time: the controversies, disputes, differences, agreements, and opinions are all of interest, but meanwhile the stream is bearing the ship onward, and quite as interesting a matter, and a more important one, is the question, Where is the stream taking it, and what doing to it? The cross-currents and eddies which dis-

¹ R. W. Inge, *Faith and its Psychology*, p. vi.

turb the surface of a river often blind us to the real fact that these whirlpools which seem to endanger the vessel are themselves swept steadily forward by an invisible current which constitutes the real force of the stream. If one can get the direction of this current and calculate the forces which are sweeping it on, one gets a clearer view of the meaning of things than if he considers a narrower group of phenomena.

What, then, are the most vital forces in our present history? What ones have acted most effectively during the last hundred years? Though civilization is an organic growth, and history an unbroken chain, we can still characterize each age by the way in which certain elements of its life have taken the lead in shaping the mind and the mood of the world. It is not an exaggeration to say that no other two ideas or forces have had such influence in the last hundred years as Democracy and Science. Whether one likes or dislikes them,—and there are many whose dislike is most unfeigned,—it cannot be disputed that, as shaping forces in the life of the world today, no other ideas have had such a vital influence as these.

The warning cry which Goethe uttered against “the Anglo-saxon contagion” was at bottom a protest against rising democracy, and in the next generation, Renan, the most accomplished critic in Europe could see in the growing power and influence of the people only the huge, half-human form of Caliban. Yet the political institutions of Europe have been transformed by the democratic spirit, and those countries which have done the most for civilization and are now the most powerful, are, at least in theory and law, the most democratic. One of the most thoughtful students of the great forces of history today has said: “It is no mere platitude that we have reached the threshold of a new age. Democracy, Nationality, Socialism, the constitution of the modern State, the standing of the churches—all have come within the attraction of forces hitherto unknown.”² Every social disturbance, every national movement, every theoretical discussion of the great problems of history and civilization, is influenced by this full and vital idea of democracy. Its growth is one of the mysteries of history, and its definition defies all categories. It is not political

² John Morley, *Critical Essays*, vol. iv, p. 281.

equality, civil rights, representative institutions alone. It is all these and much more,—a new spirit in the world, which looks out on life from a new point of view, a burning consciousness of personality bound up with the sense of wide and universal relations. This it is which makes democracy the most powerful social force of the modern world. When it has been resisted, revolution has invariably followed. It has inspired the passion for national independence which changed the map of Europe during the last century. When it has been opposed or suppressed by authority, it has gone to extremes and formulated theories of socialism and anarchy which are not its natural evolution. It is the most dissolving force ever brought to bear upon old institutions and the ancient organization of society and the most penetrating spirit which has touched the mind of the modern man. It seems to work with the relentlessness of a physical law. For more than a hundred years it has been moving steadily forward through the civilization of the western world, and now, strangest sight of all, this most revolutionary and fiery force of modern history is disturbing and inspiring the immobility of the East.

To political institutions and political theorists it is the greatest portent in history. To some it is the hag at the foot of the guillotine, counting the heads of the aristocrats as they fall into the basket; to others it is the young goddess upon the mountain top, with the Phrygian cap upon her head and something of the Phrygian madness in her eye. It has no traditions and cherishes few memories, is devoid of reverence or respect for the past and has about it something of the ruthlessness of the glacier. All anachronisms, all unreality, are swept away by the slow-moving torrent.

On the side of social and political privilege democracy has been brought into conflict with religion or religious institutions, and it has again and again been called irreligious and atheistic because of its attitude towards these institutions. When we look at history frankly, without personal or party prejudice, we see that the vast mass of Christian institutions have been anti-democratic in their origin; that is, they rest upon privilege. All religious institutions and organizations follow the type presented by the social development and constitution of the age in which they

arise. In the reconstruction of society after the fall of the Roman Empire and before the consolidation of the modern states, while the mass of the population was still heathen, Christianity was the religion of the governing classes, with the cities as its centres, and when the villagers or pagans were christianized, they became members of a church already based upon aristocratic principles. As a result, when any political disturbance has seemed to trench upon the hereditary powers, the great rallying cries have always been "Throne and Altar" or "Church and King." There is nothing discreditable to religion in this attitude; it is simply the struggle between the past and the future; and whatever the abuses and tyrannies of the past have been, democracy is now the spirit which holds the future in its hands.

As a consequence of the century of struggle, we find that the church, as a privileged institution and a legal establishment, has been steadily losing ground. The oldest political institution in Europe, the papacy, is shorn of all its temporalities, and as the nations one by one advance in culture and intellectual progress, the church is everywhere being displaced from its position of privilege. One need not say, as its opponents often do, that the church is in spirit essentially and necessarily anti-democratic; the contrary might be affirmed without much question; but as an historical institution it has seemed for many centuries to be on the anti-democratic side of human affairs, and with the rise of the new social order the disestablishment of every church in Europe seems inevitable. So high a representative of the existing order as the late Lord Coleridge, chief justice of England, felt the difficulty of reconciling an established church with the democratic spirit.

Not only as an institution has the church felt the influence of democracy; it has also been affected in its interior life. Democracy knows nothing and cares nothing for historical precedents; what it demands is efficiency. The doctrine of efficiency may seem to some to be overworked in the present day, but in opposition to the historic platitudes which are continually brought forth by ecclesiastics and theologians, it has vitality, for it represents the working convictions of a huge mass of sincere and upright, though unlearned, men. Tell such as these of the great

antiquity of certain institutions and of their unquestioned right to demand the acquiescence and obedience of men; this has to them much the air of political party appeals, and democracy is cold, feeling that the age of an institution is rather proof that it needs to be overhauled and adapted to the needs of the modern situation. No doubt in many if not most instances this is totally wrong in theory and springs out of an intelligence exceedingly crude and sadly disrespectful to history. But the great democratic mass goes on serenely, neither caring for criticism nor heeding complaints. Accomplished facts are what make to it the most convincing appeal.

To be a prevailing force, religion must recognize the essentially religious nature of each individual and recognize that the only strong appeal is that of actual life and not of historical or philosophical theory. Nothing is more striking than the diffusion of the democratic spirit in the churches of our own land. Those which represent this instinct of the masses are far more extended and far greater in numbers than the purely historic churches; for the membership of the Roman Catholic church is to a great extent of comparatively recent immigration. Even this church, with all its anti-modern tendencies, has to reckon with the democratic spirit. When a representative of the people which has traditionally been most loyal and submissive to the Holy See says, "We will take our religion from Rome, but not our politics," we see that a new spirit is abroad and that the union of submission and freedom will soon break, on one side or the other. In our own land at least, a church which does not recognize that to succeed or fail with the plain people is to succeed or fail as a religious institution, is in a bad way. It was told of a thoughtful English scholar that when an attempt was made to excite his alarm against the church of Rome by quoting the number of aristocratic families or parts of families which had been converted to that church, he replied: "Show me where the grocer and the workingman is turning to the Church of Rome and then I shall begin to feel uneasy about the Church of England." The real problem is not to win over the rich or the fashionable, but to get hold of the common people. So the church which will make itself most effective, and will have the largest influence in shaping

the social life and moral growth of the nation, is the one which recognizes the full meaning of the democratic spirit.

In addition to the expressed or unexpressed desire for efficiency, first, last, and always, there is a deep, inarticulate wish, springing out of the heart of democracy, for simplicity. And by simplicity is meant something real, effective, connected directly with the moral and spiritual life, and necessarily something which can be stated so clearly and plainly that the wayfaring man will not misunderstand. A noble English missionary bishop once said, "There is nothing essential to the gospel of Jesus Christ which cannot be made plain to the dullest savage in five minutes." If this be not true, the universality of the gospel is at once destroyed. If it be true, there is much in the way in which the gospel is presented to men that needs to be corrected. Such a process of simplification would indeed make terrible work with theology, but it would help men to get hold of what is vital, and that would be an immense advance over the incredible abstractions which have been and are still set forth to men as the things by which they shall live. The attitude of the democratic spirit towards all these subtleties of theology is one of indifference as well as ignorance. It does not understand them nor does it pretend to understand, and, with all respect, it does not care to understand.

What shall be done with this recalcitrant mass which cries out for simplicity? We know too well what is done,—the plausible theories, the so-called "truths of the gospel," the barbarous and vulgar inventions which are set forth in the name of simplicity. The cry of the Roman proletariat, "*panem et circenses*," has found its echo in many of the efforts which the necessities of the case have developed in this modern world, with its burden of ignorance, poverty, and seething unrest, and, as a result, much is done under the name of Christian charity which sacrifices true manhood and nobleness of character. This however seems to be unavoidable. The problem of presenting religion to a large, free, and to a great extent unintelligent democracy has never before been attempted by the Christian church, and it was to be expected that many blunders and mistakes should be made before the energy could find its proper expression and exert its full power.

Simplicity does not mean crudeness or vulgarity, though these are often mistaken for it. A real faith in democracy involves the highest appeals and the noblest response, or at least the possibility of these; but the process of readjustment to new conditions must be slow, with many halting steps and many backward glances to the old paths on which past ages moved. Though circumstances change, though social conditions are profoundly modified, though new economic and moral questions present a different front to the anxious eye, the underlying facts of human nature and the eagerness and restlessness of the human soul are still the same, and they are groping for and dumbly craving the old eternal satisfactions. The absolute freedom of democracy in the field of the spirit brings to light new and morbid excesses and strange, even grotesque, expressions of the religious instinct. Probably few more unscientific, unphilosophical, and unreasonable religious movements have spread so widely and so rapidly as those we find in our own so-called enlightened democracy of today. It is these things which rouse contempt and fear for the uncertain ends of a democratic age. Yet these same things reveal the real ineffectiveness of the general religious attitude towards the broad movements of our social life. If truth is intended for men, if they have a natural appetite and capacity for it, then it is possible to present every truth, even the most abstract and subtle, the most profound and spiritual, to every man. One of the great reasons why Phillips Brooks exercised such a wide and noble influence was that this was one of the deepest convictions of his own soul, and he applied it always with fearless confidence. "The people will get the heart out of the most thorough and thoughtful sermon, if only it really is a sermon. Even subtlety of thought, the tracing of intricate relations of ideas, it is remarkable how men of no subtle thought will follow it, if it is really preached."³

As one looks over the tumult of our modern democratic society, it often seems to be entirely without idealism of any high and inspiring character; all its ends are material, all its convictions utilitarian. Yet the paean of "Triumphant Democracy" which was chanted in rather strident tones a generation ago, has already

³ Lectures on Preaching, p. 113.

lost something of its force and is less and less assertive, as moral unrest and spiritual hunger disturb its self-confidence. It is beginning to be understood that the denial of idealism has brought the cheapening of life, the vulgarizing of the human soul and the repudiation of those "high instincts" which make the worth of life, and that the vindication of the reality of man's spiritual nature is the first step towards a sure appeal to the multitude. Religion is idealism, and in the directness and simplicity of its appeal lies its moral efficiency. The prime necessity of a democracy is character, for character is the foundation of national life. A thoughtful English historian says, "The essential qualities of national greatness are moral not material."⁴ To strengthen this conviction and build upon it will widen the power of religion and bring the spiritual significance of life before men as the most impressive and important of realities.

To say, however, that democracy as we now understand it is to be the ultimate form of human society is to deny the law of social evolution, which is progress; to define the outcome of that progress is at once to set the bounds and end the movement of our social life; but for the present and the immediate future, democracy is the great factor in the political evolution of the most modern and progressive nations.

Far removed from the turbulent life of the crowd, the noise of success and defeat, the strife of parties and the struggle of politics, exists another movement quite as significant, yet to the vast mass comparatively unknown and unintelligible,—that is, the progress of science. Its economic and material effects are part of the means by which our modern industrial and democratic society has been able to establish itself. These, however, are but the outward application of conceptions which have profoundly changed the whole order of human thought. For the real meaning and worth of science to the student of history is the change in the world of thought, the new horizon and the new methods. Since the time when the Copernican system swept away the cosmology that had ruled the world from the Babylonian days, the new knowledge and the new conceptions have been creating a new world and a new mind in that world.

⁴ Lecky, *History of England*, vol. i, p. 490.

In its broadest aspect, science is the organized expression of that passion for truth which has always been the distinguishing feature of man's history, but in its more technical sense it means that body of laws and truths which are most specifically the result of the application of the inductive method to the field of human investigations. To many, science, on account of its revolutionary character, has seemed to be but another name for atheism and destruction, and its progress only wider devastation. This feeling no doubt has some ground in what has been said and written on both sides of the question, but much of it is due to a confusion of terms and a misunderstanding of the real problem. "The controversy between science and religion," as it was once called, is now seldom heard except among those vociferous orators who always seek an audience and find the warmest welcome where there is the least intelligence. But the much-discussed controversy was in fact misstated. There never was any controversy between science and religion. The battle was between science and theology and often between scientists and theologians, in both of which cases the problem is entirely different. Theology is simply the thoughts, theories, and reflections of men upon problems which are forever with us and upon which we may always expect more light. That any conclusions should be infallible to any degree, if there are degrees in infallibility, depends entirely upon the knowledge and power of the individual mind. To take these conclusions, no matter how carefully drawn or from whatever sources of knowledge, and then affirm their undying truth, their unchanging form and their everlasting authority, is simply to affirm that progress in knowledge has finally ended. Nowhere has such an assumption been more conclusively denied than in theology itself. Science therefore is but the living continuation of the same conviction in a new field and with new methods. How it has altered, when it has not destroyed, many of the theological theories of the past can be seen by contrasting with them any of the most elementary handbooks on geology, astronomy, or biology, to go no farther afield. But religion, or the religious instinct, has not been destroyed and is no longer denied. Rather it is affirmed with unfaltering conviction by the most severely scientific students and thinkers of our own day.

The three primary factors in all our thinking, God, the universe, and man, and the two elements of religion, man and God, have been entirely changed in their relation to each other, and new conceptions have sprung out of the new knowledge. God is no longer the mechanician, standing outside of and apart from a universe which he has constructed and which requires his constant care and attention lest it get out of order, as was thought by Paley and the deists; but he is the living energy which moves forever:

“A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.”

The universe is a vast organism in which the divine life finds its manifestation. Mind and will, thought and cause, play in endless expression through the changing evolution of the visible. The bright glare which revealed the outlines of a stiff and rigid mechanism is veiled in mystery through which the energy of a vital will is forever throbbing. Man, his own greatest mystery, stands no longer as a fallen angel whose degradation fills life with an unspeakable melancholy after the supreme moment when heaven lay about him in his infancy. But in the midst of vast cosmic forces which through endless time have slowly evolved the conditions of his existence, he stands at last and looks back to the darkness out of which he came, to the depths from which he rose.

The moral value of the difference in point of view is enormous. The new standpoint checks the rashness of the dogmatist and the audacity of the anarchist. Civilization is seen to be not the degradation of a lost race or the contrivance of a selfish despotism. It is the result of a long travail which stretches back beyond the rim of history and rests upon the movement of the stars. At its roots lie the prayers and struggles which through the long ages of the life of humanity have followed the sun round a sorrowing world. The scientific interpretation of the universe has given a new meaning and a new worth to civilization. We see that the difference between barbarism and civilization does not lie in material achievements or intellectual conquests but in the ethical values which have come after fierce struggle, awful waste, and

mighty conflicts between striving ideals. So the solution of history lies not in physical conquests or material success, but in moral growth, and that means time and suffering.

It is the method of science rather than its results, the conceptions upon which it rests rather than the conclusions which it has reached, that are most significant for theology and religion. It is but little more than fifty years since Darwin placed before the world the first results of his great investigations. His tone was so modest and the significance of his work so little apparent that some years passed before the full meaning of his vast generalization was recognized. There are those now living who can remember the cry of fear and horror which then rose upon the air. Many careful constructions of theologians and philosophers which had been built up so painfully through the ages were swept away. The skilful theories which had sought to interpret the divine mind were shattered as they stood. God, man, the universe, religion, all the tender and noble memories and instincts of the race, seemed thrown down in one wide and universal ruin, while a blind and mysterious force in unknown ways moulded unconscious matter into the things which are. Many of these passionate champions of orthodoxy would rub their eyes if they were to enter into the inner life of the world's best and most inspiring thought today. The fundamental conception of the scientist has become the heart of the world's most vigorous thinking. The theory of evolution is the working hypothesis of every great and progressive science which occupies the mind of man.

In its sweep and operation the scientific spirit has many resemblances to the democratic, and works unconsciously for the same ends. Science is as jealous of prerogative and privilege as democracy. It recognizes no sacred preserves and has invaded the territory hitherto so jealously guarded by the ecclesiastic and the theologian. It refuses to believe that any class of men are endowed with the power to work a daily miracle or speak authoritatively the mind of God. Religion itself has become the study not of the theologian alone, but of the psychologist, philosopher, and scientist. Philology too, working on the strictest scientific principles, has opened up new fields of knowledge, and the theory of evolution is the power by which are called forth

the secrets of archaeology, the history of man, and the primitive institutions of society. In the field of church history, including the history of doctrine as well as of institutions, the play of universal laws is recognized and the development and growth of all ideas and institutions is seen to conform to the principles which prevail in the whole order of things. The foundations of Christian doctrine are uncovered and shown to rest, not as was once supposed, entirely in the Christian consciousness, but largely in historical conditions and metaphysical theories. Everywhere the story is the same. There are no sacred regions, no closed territory where science cannot venture and evolution must be excluded in the interests of theological or historical systems and theories.

Like democracy, science asks for reality, and the only reality it recognizes is that which is demonstrated in the facts of life and character. So though it touches religion with no partial eye or tender hand, it grasps the problem with a wider conception than lay behind much of the theological interpretations of the past. It assumes the validity of all forms of religion and recognizes their truthfulness as expressions of the essentially religious nature of man, while it differentiates them not on the basis of race, history, or theology, but on ethical and spiritual grounds. The revelation of the divine in the world is from everlasting to everlasting, but the highest revelation, the truest religion, comes through the struggle for existence, and stands as the highest because it survives and proves through life and history its working value and its spiritual worth. This scientific point of view is often shocking to sensitive and reverent minds, but it has this great merit at least, that it is founded on reality and so satisfies one of the requirements of democracy.

When we compare these two forces of our modern world and penetrate into their inner constitution and meaning, we find that they have many resemblances and are working in the same direction though not on the same plane. In its general view of society, science asks for laws and facts scientifically understood instead of theories based upon ignorance, prejudice, or selfishness. Science like democracy is a striking illustration of what may be called the economy of the universe. A single force once set in motion

may and does produce a variety of effects as it moves in different fields of activity and operation. To enumerate all the modifications and influences which have sprung from this creative idea would involve a view of all the activities of human thought. It not only suggests unknown results in the future, but it throws an illuminating light upon the past. The theory of evolution enables us to understand, as no other theory does, the story of the past of man as an organic development of partial truths and imperfectly apprehended ideas working out to a completer and fuller expression through the infinite vicissitudes of life. When we regard this new theory from the point of view of co-operation with the great forces of democracy, we see that the effectiveness which the latter calls for is embodied in the working of principles and laws which lie behind the origin of society itself and antedate the beginnings of man's history. It declares also that these laws, or laws working by this method, will rule through all the ages yet to come. Man's achievements are not left to the passion or pride of his own will but rest upon that sublime obedience which is the glory of the stars and the moral splendor of the saint. The simplicity in religion which democracy demands is asserted as the divine method by the fundamental conceptions of science, and for the wilful choices of men it substitutes a uniform system of laws, thus strengthening and re-enforcing the affirmation of the theologian that the law of the Spirit never varies in its operation or changes in its results.

To the eyes of many the whole course and tendency of these great forces seems ominous and burdened with disaster. They are "the two-handed engine at the door" which "strikes once and strikes no more." Sacred traditions, venerable institutions, long-established theories, and time-honored convictions seem falling into one huge ruin. The actual achievements seem but a poor and inadequate compensation for so much that is vanishing and soon to pass away. The red spectre of anarchy lurks in the shadow of the ruins of our social and political institutions: the golden glow of a vivid faith which made life radiant to so many beautiful souls in the ages gone by fades away in the cheerless gloom which gross desires and austere conceptions seem to create. The whole movement and process seems critical, nega-

tive, and destructive. No preserving power for the high sanctities and the inner life of the soul seems to issue from these forces which are sweeping society into new fortunes and new faiths. But, "though much is taken, much abides." A period of great change in history always means advance and progress when it is the result of a vigorous and energetic movement in the world's life, and surely no century since the sixteenth has had so splendid a story as the one we have just passed through, turbulent and revolutionary as it has been.

Let us glance at some of the things which abide and which stand today with new meaning, new values, and new power. With reference to the stability and permanence of civilization both the forces we have named are of immense significance. The broad basis of a democratic self-consciousness is a firmer foundation for social order than the narrow support of the most intelligent aristocracy. In the one case the strength is inherent in the whole organism, in the latter it belongs only to a part of that organism even if it be the better part. In the case of science we not only find a new and strengthening element in the conceptions of history which tends to deepen the meaning of the social fabric, but there is also added to the life of the community a great class of thoughtful and cultivated minds who divide with the old leaders many of the duties and all the responsibilities which belong to civilization.

When we consider the spiritual elements which are at the basis of the new type of character begotten by both these great forces, we see the emphasis laid primarily upon the idea of freedom. Both science and democracy assume the necessity of freedom. Now liberty is not, as many think and have thought in the past, a means to an end. It has always been the attitude of authority and privilege to make this confusion, or at least to accept it and to puzzle the instinct which was working for liberty, by making reforms in society and feeding the passion of the soul with the things of the body. Freedom is not a mere privilege or opportunity for truth, but a supreme spiritual truth itself. It is not the right to think this or that particular thing, but the atmosphere of the soul itself, the very necessity which impels to all the highest realizations of life and character. For the man of science,

freedom is the breath of life. Without it he may attain results, but he does not achieve that nobleness of mind which is the finest expression of truth. The only inconsistency which freedom will not forgive is the inconsistency of not being free. For truth is not truth to the soul unless it is voluntarily and gladly, yes, passionately, sought and obeyed. Freedom is as necessary as truth itself, for it is necessary to truth. Often in its energy and activity it seems radical, eccentric, and revolutionary, but it is the fundamental condition of life in this new world which has grown out of the old, and is the underlying power of both democracy and science.

As a creative element in the growing life of the soul, freedom has sharpened and emphasized the consciousness of personality until at times man feels alone and unfed by human hands. The man of science is an individualist by virtue of his purpose and his freedom. He cannot be otherwise. The democratic passion for liberty has fired the heart of the martyr, and the martyr is the most perfect individualist the world knows. For individualism is only the expression of the belief in the supreme worth of each soul, which has its origin and inspiration in the heart of the gospel. The ecclesiastic, with his reverence for the authority of the past, and the socialist, with his contempt for it, join hands in denouncing the "exaggerated individualism" which is the child of the freedom they both fear. These exaggerations are necessary stages in the process of evolution and are in time corrected by the workings of experience. For individualism in the true sense of the word, the deep appreciation of the essential elements of personality as primary in the growth of life, strengthens the social instinct and accepts as holy the law which guards the social organism. The strength of a vital and stable as well as progressive society lies not in the mere aggregation and coherence of its parts, but in the elevation and development of the social units.

Christianity itself has not escaped the influence of this vast scientific movement, and one of the most significant results of this last century of its history lies in a field which seems purely technical and remote from the living interests of the ordinary man. For more than a century the New Testament has been the storm centre of one of the most active controversies which

have ever taken place in the history of the Christian church. The various results which have been attained need not and could not be here stated, but one which is of supreme interest to the world is the new conception of the character and person of Christ. The forms of expression have not so much altered as the sense of his life and person which are of the greatest spiritual significance. Never before has he been seen as he is now seen, even in the apostolic age. The theories which have been identified with him, and to which he has too often been subordinated, have fallen away as the shadows that darken the fountain to which men come to drink are banished by the light. He stands out now more clearly, in the simplicity of his moral and spiritual power, than he has ever before been seen. Those who first knew him and loved him most, did not and could not see all that he was and all that he would be and would do for man and in man. It is the historical reality of this personal influence through races and ages, through the infinite variety and conflict of different forces and stages in civilization, which makes him the profoundest fact in our modern life. As a spiritual force he is related to men in their highest endeavors and most lasting achievements everywhere. He is the Universal Man, the Son of Man, the Divine Democrat, "the purest of the mighty, the mightiest of the pure, who with His pierced hands lifted a world." His message comes clear and straight, answering to the deepest needs of man's deepest nature. He stands before the soul that is swathed in the grave-clothes of selfishness, sin, and death, bound hand and foot by the fetters of custom, tradition, and ignorance, and the clear voice, in calm and conquering tones, utters the command: "Loose him and let him go."